

REMARKS

The present application was filed on October 31, 2003 with claims 1-20. Claims 1, 3-11 and 14-20 remain pending. Claims 1, 4, 9 and 17-20 are the pending independent claims.

Claims 1, 4-8, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152110 (hereinafter “Stewart”) in view of “javascript thread: Wait until another frame is loaded?,” Wrox Programmer to Programmer, March 5, 2003, <http://p2p.wrox.com/archive/javascript/2003-03/13.asp> (hereinafter “Programmer”).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart and Programmer in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,107,285 (hereinafter “Kaenel”).

Claims 9-11, 14-16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0018714 (hereinafter “Mikhailov”) in view of Programmer.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikhailov and Programmer in view of Stewart.

Applicants conceived and/or reduced to practice an invention failing within the scope of the independent claims at least as early as April 2, 2002. As such, Applicants expressly reserve the right to antedate the Programmer reference in the present application and/or any continuing application.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5, and have canceled claims 3, 4, 8-11 and 14-20 in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that these claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method of processing a web page in a browser. The web page comprises a plurality of frames. The method comprising the steps of displaying a first frame while loading a second frame; and preventing a user from interacting with the first frame until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded, said prevention occurring after a determination is made that the first frame depends on the second frame, otherwise, permitting the user to interact with the first frame regardless of whether the second frame is sufficiently loaded.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate an additional limitation wherein the first frame is displayed until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded regardless of whether the user is permitted to interact with the first frame. Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 3, canceled herein, wherein the preventing step further comprises instructing the user to wait to interact with the first frame until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded.

Support for these amendments to claim 1 may be found in the present specification at page 8, line 5, to page 9, line 7, with reference to FIG. 2. In the illustrative client-based methodology 200 for avoiding errors when interacting with partially loaded pages shown in FIG. 2, a live frame is shown to the user at the client (via monitor 102), however, interactions are intercepted and the user is asked to try again (to interact) when the page fully loads. A “live frame” refers to a frame that is active, i.e., the user can interact with (e.g., click on hyperlinks, enter data, select items, etc.).

When the user sends a request (step 201) to the server 104 to access a web page, the page begins loading (step 202). In some special case, Frame #1 depends on Frame #2’s information to continue (step 207). It is very common that Frame #1 is already activated, and Frame #2 is still in the process of loading (step 208). To determine if the user can continue working on Frame #1, the methodology checks if Frame #1 depends on Frame #2 (step 207). If no dependency is found, the user can be allowed to interact with Frame #1 (step 211). If a dependency exists between Frame #1 and Frame #2, a check is made to determine whether Frame #2 is fully loaded (step 208). If loaded, the user is allowed to work with Frame #1 (step 211) and so on. If not loaded, the user is instructed via an alert message to wait (step 209), while Frame #2 continues loading (step 210). The browser 103 continues to load more data from Frame #2. If the user tries to interact with Frame #1 (step 204) during this process, e.g., a subapplication is requested (step 205), an alert message pops up to tell the user to wait until the page is fully loaded (step 206). Once the user has addressed the alert message, Frame #2 keeps loading (step 203). This process continues until the page has completely loaded (end block 212). Thus, advantageously, if Frame #1 and Frame #2 are fully loaded or if Frame #1 does not depend on Frame #2, then the user is allowed to interact with Frame #1. However, if Frame #2 depends on Frame #1 and Frame #2 is not fully loaded, or if the user requests a subapplication (e.g., associated with Frame #2), then the user is instructed to wait until Frame #2 fully loads.

Applicants respectfully submit that the references of record fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 as amended. For example, in formulating the rejection of claim 1 in the present Office Action, the Examiner contends that Stewart at [0051] discloses preventing a user from interacting with a first portion of the received information until after a second portion of the received information is sufficiently loaded.

Even if one were to accept the Examiner's characterization of the relied-upon portion of Stewart, Applicants respectfully submit that the relied-upon portion of Stewart fails to teach or suggest the limitation of claim 1 wherein the first frame is displayed until after the second frame is sufficiently loaded regardless of whether the user is permitted to interact with the first frame.

The relied-upon portion of Stewart teaches an arrangement wherein an "application overlays a layer over the Web page that is loading the graphic. The application then removes the layer after the graphics on the underlying page have finished loading." Thus, while the graphic is loading, the web page that is loading the graphic is not displayed, but rather is hidden behind a masking layer. Moreover, both the web page and the graphic described by Stewart are within a single frame, rather than the respective first and second frames recited in amended claim 1. See Stewart at [0047]: "These web pages are loaded in the main frame 56 of the browser window frame set 54."

The other references of record fail to remedy the fundamental deficiency of Stewart to teach the limitations of claim 1 as amended. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 5-7 are allowable for at least the reasons identified above with regard to claim 1. One or more of these claims are also believed to define separately-patentable subject matter over the cited art.

Attorney Docket No. SOM920030008US1

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1 and 5-7 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 19, 2008

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946